

R. W. RAYMOND

OF THE ENGINEERING AND MINING JOURNAL
ON RECOGNITION.

This Innocent Looking Word Means a Great Deal More Than Appears on the Surface.—An Article Well Worth Reading.

Experienced operators in the anthracite region have been accustomed to look for important strikes at intervals of about a dozen years. Their explanation used to be that this period was required to enable the labor organizations to recover from the effects of a strike; to forget how little they had gained by it in comparison with what they had lost, and to raise up a generation of young men who had no knowledge of the hardships of such an enterprise and were eager for the excitement of it. In fact, the older miners, who owned houses and lots and had money in bank (or at still better rates of interest in the hands of their employers), have always opposed strikes, but have been overborne by the hot-headed young men. It is a significant fact, moreover, that the "bosses," or foremen, have always been staunchly loyal to their duty on such occasions. Yet these men were only miners, more intelligent than the rest, and therefore advanced to higher responsibilities. The striking miners have never included men who knew enough to run a colliery.

In connection with the strike of 1887-8 I published (in this journal, January 14, 1888) a careful statement of causes and conditions, which might be well high repeated verbatim as a description of the present situation. Then, as now, the strike was "part of a deliberate plan to conquer, once for all, the anthracite business"—and this was part of a wider and wilder plan to rule the country, in spite of law and justice, by a comparatively small minority of its laborers, arrogating unto themselves the title of representing "labor." Then, as now, the anthracite miners were commanded to strike by the leaders of organizations not connected with the anthracite business. Then it was Mr. Powderly, the head of the Knights of Labor, who acted as commander-in-chief. In one view of the matter this was more ridiculous than the domination of Mr. Mitchell; for the Knights of Labor, comprising cigarmakers, silk weavers, car drivers, etc., was a ludicrous aggregation of disinterested ignorance. But, in fact, the present control of the anthracite miners by Mr. Mitchell, the representative of a rival industry, is more dangerous to them, though more dignified to the public eye, than the motley authority which shouted its commands to them fourteen years ago. Yet the same element appears in both cases—the doctrine and dream of an impossible "solidarity" of "labor"—the conception of industrial society as a state of chronic war, interspersed with temporary truces.

The strike of 1900 came on time; and if it had been fought out, like its predecessors, we should not have had the strike of today, which is, in fact, only the renewal of the conflict then postponed, and aggravated by concessions, which, though not constituting a surrender on the part of the operators, were interpreted by the "labor leaders" as so much of victory won and a pledge of success in the further campaign. Anything that can be construed as a "recognition" of

the Mine Workers' Union is now the aim pursued. "Recognition" sounds innocent enough; it is the least that courtesy requires in common life, and many good people seem to think that employers are highly churlish and selfish if they will not even "recognize" the union.

But our modern labor unions have a dictionary of their own; that book, like all dictionaries, reflects current usage; and, recalling what the last few years have given us of this usage, we see that "recognition" means, first of all, that the union shall dictate who shall be employed and who discharged; that it shall fix not only the day's length and the day's pay, but also the day's performance; that "non-union" labor shall not be permitted; that discipline shall be subject to the approval of the union; that boycotts declared by it shall be obeyed by the employer. In one case, I remember, he was required to reserve from the wages of the men their dues and fines, and pay these to the union. When he refused to do this unlawful thing he was commanded to discharge a man who had refused to pay a fine; and when he refused to obey, a strike was ordered which lasted for months and involved some 20,000 workmen. All this because he had committed the very simple and innocent mistake of "recognizing" a union.

"Recognition" involves the free admission of the "walking delegate" or his equivalent into all works, shops or mines, for the purpose of detecting "scabs," or union members in bad standing—i. e., in arrears for dues. In some places and trades it means that neither owner nor foreman can give orders to his individual employees. All communication with them must be had through an official of their own choosing. And, finally (though there is no reason for closing the list here, except the lack of space for further items), "recognition" means that every contract or agreement made with a given union or branch may be broken at the will of some larger body when it is believed that the interests of labor in general require such a violation of promise.

I know that Mr. Mitchell made an excellent speech at Indianapolis, in which he urged the national convention not to order a general strike, which would violate contracts. But his skirts are not cleared completely by that late disclaimer. After all, I cannot find in his address any thing higher than arguments of policy. There are earnest representations of the "unwisdom" of the step; of the bad effect it would have on the public; of the general failure of sympathetic strikes; but no manly declaration that the thing itself would be wicked; that, if it were ordered, he would resign rather than be the agent to carry out such bad faith. On the contrary, the impression cannot be escaped that Mr. Mitchell was prepared to go on and do his best, accepting the vote of the convention as his sufficient moral warrant. In the Hazleton convention he had opposed the strike, and when it was voted over his head made haste to organize it

and justify it as a rebellion against "intolerable" conditions. That is what he would have done if the Indianapolis convention had ordered the larger strike which he deprecated. He believes, just as much as anybody, that such an order must be obeyed, and that it supersedes local obligations, even of honor; for this construction of such obligations is involved in the "recognition" of the union. Even now his official committees are reported to be notifying bituminous coal operators that if their coal gets to anthracite using districts, so as to relieve the suffering and loss of the public, their workmen will be called out, contract or no contract.

But it is scarcely necessary to bring any proofs beyond the significant and comprehensive fact that a convention called by Mr. Mitchell and representing, with his knowledge, numerous bodies of workmen bound by contracts, deliberates whether it shall order those contracts to be broken, and is addressed by him as if he had the right to give that order.

The only escape from this conclusion is the declaration often made that the bituminous miners could have broken their agreement without dishonor, because all such agreements contained or implied the proviso that sympathetic strikes might make it necessary to break them. Very well. Then I am justified in repeating that "recognition" involves the unreliability of all promises made by the union. If a man hires non-union laborers they will be bound by their agreements; if he "recognizes" the union his laborers will not be so bound. They may or not be true to him—that will depend upon a convention held to consider the question, and upon the nature of the speeches there made by Mr. Mitchell and others! Is it any wonder that those who know the union best are least inclined to "recognize" it? But there are two other kinds of "recognition," though they do not go by that name, and usage has fixed meanings for these, also.

The first is the recognition of the union by magistrates, judges, sheriffs, legislators, shopkeepers, priests, doctors, publishers and editors. This involves what is called "fair" treatment of the members and acts of the union, and aid, both active and passive, in its holy war upon the hostile, the lukewarm and the would-be independent (i. e., according to usage, the "scab"). Credit must be given to the men who have sworn not to work; cash must be refused from those who are working, and those who are trying to protect the workers from violence. All statutes made to guard person or property from violence or conspiracy must contain provisions explicitly exempting "labor unions" from their operation. Governors must not call out troops, and, above all, the power of the United States must not be invoked when local powers have failed, for the soldiers of Uncle Samuel have a most uncomfortable way of not recognizing "labor" or anything else when it is engaged in breaking the peace.

But there remains the "recognition" of the union which is exacted from its own members and other wage-earners. To the members it means, among other things, that they must abandon work without grievance or knowledge of grievance (as the bridge strikers in New York have just done) at the command of organized labor in general; that when they thus strike they will get no

help in money (as the unions who struck in aid of the steel-workers found out); that when, at last, relief is provided or promised, it will be given, if given at all, to the shiftless only, and not to those who have saved money; in other words, that a member of the union is expected to contribute to its fighting fund, not nearly all that he has paid into its treasury for that purpose, but also all that he has laid by for his wife and children. And when, impoverished and discouraged, he returns to work (if luck has favored "labor"), with ten per cent increase of wages, or some "concession" of that sort, and reflects that he sacrificed 50 per cent of his year's earnings to secure this result, he is expected to join in the chorus, "But 'twas a famous victory!" and commence to lay up money for another! Truly this kind of recognition is the cruellest of all, and we are amazed that thousands of honest and well-meaning men are betrayed into it. The cause is two-fold. It is partly terrorism and partly a spirit of heroic, unselfish self-sacrifice for the sake of organized labor in general. The nature and extent of the terrorism has never been adequately told. It is largely ignored by philanthropic theorists as a mere incident in the elevation of "labor." The unselfish sacrifice, on the other hand, has been abundantly lauded, without due exposure of the false basis on which it rests, and in view of which, it is as lamentable as the bravery of the followers of the Mahdi.

Perhaps I may add that there is still one more way of recognizing the most modern form of "labor unionism"—namely, by seeing in it the familiar features of old errors, old tyrannies, old schemes of the demagogue and the bandit, old class antagonisms, artificially revived, old traps for the sympathetic, and old lures for the unscrupulous. It seems to me, sometimes, that I do recognize the union, after all!

R. W. RAYMOND.

The Crow's Nest Pass Coal Field.

The Crow's Nest Pass coal field on the western slope of the Rockies was discovered in 1887, but was not opened on a commercial scale until after the completion of the Crow's Nest branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in 1899, since when the output has increased year by year with giant strides, until, during 1901, the production reached 529,210 tons. It is estimated that this field covers about 280 square miles. The coal seams, of which there are several, show an aggregate thickness of 216 feet, the seams varying from 1 to 46 feet thick, respectively. This total thickness of coal seems to occur in a measurement of 4,736 feet of Cretaceous coal measures, which overlie Carboniferous limestone. At the present time only two of the seams are being mined at the Coal Creek collieries near the town of Fernie, but at the Michel Creek and Morrissey Creek collieries openings are being made on several seams, in order to increase the output to meet the demands of the market.

The coal field is triangular in shape, with the base line extending along the east side of the Elk River Valley in British Columbia for a distance of about 25 miles, and the apex of the triangle situated on the eastern slope of the Rockies in Alberta Territory.

The western boundary of the coal field is marked by an escarpment several hundred feet high, and the territory covered by the Cretaceous rocks is mountainous and includes the summit of the Rockies as well as both slopes. Three creeks cut through the escarpment and empty into Elk River, thus affording good opportunities for opening mines for the outcroppings at points where the dip of the measures is more nearly horizontal than is the case along the escarpment.—By W. M. Brewer, in Mines and Minerals, for August.

DOWN IN THE MINES.

Cashier Dan M. Evana and family are now enjoying themselves in the east. Dan deserves a rest. Probably no one connected with the St. Bernard Company puts in more hours and works more days in the year than he does, and therefore a vacation is needed, but the miners may rest assured that he will be back at his post of duty before pay day rolls around.

Foreman Harry Corey of the St. Bernard Company's farm has finally persuaded himself that he needs a few days vacation, so accompanied by his wife, he is now busy seeing the sights in the east.

Sixty million dollars is the estimated cost of the anthracite coal strike up to date—that is the value placed upon the whole Louisville & Nashville railroad system, and just think of the enormous loss the striking miners have sustained. Of course the loss to the operators has been heavy, but small compared to the loss to the miners who have for months past lost millions in wages, and Mitchell, their President, says they voted the trouble on themselves, and when they get ready they can throw up their hands and cry enough.

One day last week we fell in conversation with one of the active members of the U. M. W., if there is such a thing as a real live member in this region at the present time, and he told us that he and others of the few faithful had been called east to act under Mitchell's orders to preserve peace if possible in the anthracite regions by advising the strikers to refrain from riotous acts. Of course this is in keeping with their past record. Publicly they declare for peace, but in their closed chambers they plan and cause to be planned schemes that often lead to riot and murder, and when the latter occurs it is part of the play, as they did last week, to be among the first to denounce it, so therefore the eastern operators should keep a close watch on what is called those "angels of peace," because within they are "ravenous wolves." Any leader from this region of the U. M. W. cannot be trusted to lend a helping hand in hand in preserving peace and order, especially when he is now resting under an indictment of the Hopkins county Circuit Court on the charge of intimidation, which applies to the fellow here referred to.

Last week one of the gang now almost universally known as habitual idlers, boasted of the fact that he had carefully housed up five repeating rifles, and when questioned about the object of arming the U. M. W. he answered that it was all done for self defense, and yet the history of crimes committed in this and adjoining counties for the last year or two in connection with the coal trouble, shows without a single contradiction sustained by the facts, that the offenders were some of the gang acting under the leadership of such things as Wood, Chappell and Barnaby, all three of whom now stand indicted for the part they took in the dastardly affairs.

Weigher John M. Hogan of the No. 9 mine says he was one of a party who a few years ago partly explored the Providence coal regions with the avowed purpose of locating and developing a coal mine in the same territory now being tested by the St. Bernard

Company but a serious hitch in the proceedings put a scotch in the wheels, yet John thinks the field is an immense one; in fact one of the greatest in Kentucky.

Although last week was fair week the records of No. 9 mine show that no entire day was lost and that with the exception of the delay caused by broken machinery it was a week of steady work for the miners, who on the whole took little interest in the fair.

Henderson will if present plans do not miscarry, soon boast of another coal mine which will be located south of town a short distance. Work on the sinking of a shaft is already under headway, and now the question arises, will the mine, when opened, be like the other three, fully under the control of the U. M. W., or will the investors of capital have a word to say in the operation?

A large number of miners, it is stated, have been summoned east by President Mitchell and the question now arises, what part are they to play in the settlement of the anthracite strike? Most of these go from Illinois and Indiana, we are informed.

Quite a number of the colored miners who left here to attend the Hopkins County Fair never reached their destination, so we are informed. The side attractions at Madisonville proving too much for them.

Among those who showed their religious inclinations last Sunday by attending the camp meeting at Sebree was J. M. Hogan, Wyatt Ford and William Jennings all St. Bernard Co's workers.

The effort to vote saloons out of Madisonville will no doubt receive the hearty support of the miners who see what ruin liquor has wrought and the large sum of money monthly spent at these soul destroyers where they never get value received. Lend the good people of Madisonville a helping hand and drive the saloons from the country.

It is reported that the Nortonville Coal Co., have bought the old electric light plant at Paducah and that Nortonville will soon be seen by the bright light.

What the U. M. W. failed to do has been accomplished by foreman Toombs and crew this week, the shutting down of the Victoria mines. Steady and constant work has finally told on the buildings, and repairs became absolutely necessary. So the old has been pulled down and the new erected this week and if calculations do not miscarry everything will be in shape to resume work next Monday.

The St. Bernard Mining Company will erect a fine brick engine house at St. Charles at once. George Farnsworth has charge of the charge of the work.

Urgent business has called Mining Engineer F. D. Rash to the Webster county coal field this week. It is now claimed the knowing ones that the St. Bernard Mining Company's holdings in that county will prove to be the greatest coal field in Kentucky.

The Senators from Pennsylvania have been appealed to by some of the citizens of that state to use their influence toward a settlement of the mining trouble, but as the operators have taken the stand that there is no question at issue that will permit of arbitration, there is little that they can do.

(CONTINUED ON PAGE 3.)